

**Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District Office
HRFO (W010)**

Categorical Exclusion

CX#: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2015-0029-CX

Date: 5/20/2015

Lease / Case File / Serial #: N-46572

Regulatory Authority (CFR or Law): 2800

BLM Manual: 2800

Subject Function Code: 28

Is the project located within a Preliminary Priority Habitat? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Is the project located within a Preliminary General Priority Habitat? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Is the project located within a National Landscape Conservation System feature (NCA, Wilderness, WSA, ISA, Scenic or Historic Trails)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

1. BLM District Office: Winnemucca District Office

2. Name of Project Lead: Debbie Dunham

3. Project Title: N-46572 Amended ROW

4. Applicant: CC Communications

5. Project Description: (briefly describe who, what, when, where, why, how)

CC Communications submitted an application to amend their communication site ROW N-46572, on March 23, 2015, located on Desert Peak. They would like to add another 20 feet to the existing 60 foot communications tower for a total of 80 feet. The reason for the tower extension is because there is not enough space on the tower for the proposed/needed modifications. Also, there is a long coverage gap along I-80 between Miriam and Fernley and spotty coverage between Miriam and Fallon, along Hwy 95.

They also want to add the steel building purchased from High Sierra Communications that is already on the site.

They do not have a start date, as that will be determined once all agreements have been executed by Verizon and CC Communications upon approval of the tower extension from BLM.

Scope of work and equipment:

Week # 1 – Tower section/Tower Mod install work: (QTC), Dually Truck with 18' enclosed tool trailer (onsite all week); Dually Truck with 24 foot flatbed delivery trailer (first 2 days only);

CX#: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2015-0029-CX

Applicant: CC Communications

Project Title: N-46572 Amended ROW

10K 4x4 Grade all/Forklift (3 days to build tower section on the ground); 40 ton Crane to stack new section (onsite 1 day Vontour Rigging & Crane).

Week#2 – Tower RF work: (QTC), Dually Truck with 18foot enclosed tool trailer (onsite all week); Dually Truck with 24 foot flatbed delivery trailer (first 2 days only); pick-up truck for Tester (on site the last 2 days to perform the Sweep/PIM testing).

Week #3 – If needed – Tower/RF/Mod Work: (QTC), Dually Truck with 18 foot enclosed tool trailer (onsite all week).

They are requesting three temporary staging areas outside their communication site ROW fence. Truck parking 40 feet long X 12 feet wide; Crane staging 45 feet long X 20 feet wide; and the new tower section 20 feet long X 20 feet wide. Please see attached aerial photo.

Project dimensions (length, width, height, depth): 330 feet long and 180 feet wide.

Total Acres: 1.36

BLM Acres: 1.36

Will the project result in new surface disturbance? ☐Yes ☒No

Has the project area been previously disturbed? ☒Yes ☐No ☐N/A

If yes, what percent of the project area has been disturbed? 100%. If only part of the project area has been disturbed, indicate disturbed area on map. Describe disturbance (and attach photo of disturbed area if you have one):

6. Legal Description: T.22 N., R. 27 E., sec. 10, E2SE, SESE, NWSE.

USGS 24k Quad name: Desert Peak, NV

100k map name: Carson Sink, NV

Land Status: ☒ BLM ☐ Private ☐ Other_____.

Part I: Plan Conformance Review

The Proposed Action is subject to the:

- ☐ Paradise-Denio Management Framework Plan
- ☒ Sonoma-Gerlach Management Framework Plan
- ☐ Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails NCA and Associated Wilderness and Other Contiguous Lands in Nevada RMP

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable Land Use Plan (LUP) because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

L. 4.2 Reserve all mountain tops and ridges for communications sites.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Part II: NEPA Review

Categorical Exclusion Review: This Proposed Action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under:

- ☐ 43 CFR 46.210 DOI Implementation of NEPA of 1969, Listing of Departmental Categorical Exclusions (*formerly 516 DM2 Appendix 1*)
- ☒ 516 DM 11.9, (BLM) E. 13. Grants of rights-of-way, such as the upgrading of existing facilities, which entail no additional disturbances outside the right-of-way boundary.

ESA and BLM Sensitive Status Species

Evaluation Criteria	Yes	No
1. Are species listed under the Endangered Species Act likely to occur in the project area? If yes, list the species in Table 1 below. Verify with USFWS or use approved list.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Are BLM NV Sensitive Species, based upon the current IM, likely to occur in the project area? If yes, list the species in the Table 1 below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Could the proposed action result in “take” under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act? If yes, attach appropriate mitigation measures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Table 1. Special Status Species that may occur in the project area:

ESA	BLM	Common (Scientific) Name	May Be Affected?	Mitigation for BLM Sensitive Species (The following stipulation(s) is/are recommended to be applied to the authorization) (Attach ESA Section 7 Compliance to Form, if applicable)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oryctes (<i>Oryctes nevadensis</i>), Nevada dune beardtongue (<i>Penstemon arenarius</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Table 2. Migratory Bird Treaty Act Consideration

Potential MBTA Species w/in the Project Area Common (Scientific) Name	May Be Affected?	Recommended Mitigation (The following stipulation(s) is/are recommended to be applied to the authorization)
The following list is representative, but not an inclusive list of migratory birds that may utilize the proposed project area: Brewer’s sparrow (<i>Spizella breweri</i>), sage sparrow (<i>Artemisiospiza nevadensis</i>), sage thrasher (<i>Oreoscoptes montanus</i>), horned lark (<i>Eremophila alpestris</i>), golden eagle (<i>Aquila</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

<i>chrysaetos</i>), Swainson's hawk (<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>), ferruginous hawk (<i>Buteo regalis</i>), prairie falcon (<i>Falco mexicanus</i>), Western burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>), and common poorwill (<i>Phalaenoptilus nuttallii</i>).		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Mitigation Measures/Remarks (The following stipulation(s) is/are recommended to be applied to the authorization):

The Proposed Action has been reviewed to determine if any exceptions described in 43 CFR 46.215 Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances apply. (See attached page)

Part III: DECISION:

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan and that no other environmental analysis is required.

☒ Project authorization is subject to mitigation measures identified above. (This is a NEPA Decision. A separate program implementation decision is necessary.)

☐ Based on regulatory authority or law that allows BLM to take action, it is my decision to allow for implementation of the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified above and attached as stipulations, conditions of approval, terms of conditions, etc. This is a combined NEPA and program implementation decision.

Authorized Official: \s\ Aron C. King
(Signature)

Date: 08/20/15

Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

A person who wishes to appeal to the Interior Board of Land Appeals must do so under 43 CFR 4.411 and must file in the office of the officer who made the decision (not the board), in writing to Aron C. King, Humboldt River Field Office, 5100 East Winnemucca Boulevard, Winnemucca, Nevada 89445. A person served with the decision being appealed must transmit the notice of appeal in time to be filed in the office where it is required to be filed within thirty (30) days after the date of service.

The notice of appeal must give the serial number or other identification of the case and may include a statement of reasons for the appeal, a statement of standing if required by § 4.412(b), and any arguments the appellant wishes to make. Form 1842-1 provides additional information regarding filing an appeal.

No extension of time will be granted for filing a notice of appeal. If a notice of appeal is filed after the grace period provided in §4.401(a), the notice of appeal will not be considered and the case will be closed by the officer from whose decision the appeal is taken. If the appeal is filed during the grace period provided in §4.401(a) and the delay in filing is not waived, as provided in that section, the notice of appeal will not be considered and the appeal will be dismissed by the Board.

The appellant shall serve a copy of the notice of appeal and any statements of reason, written arguments, or briefs under §4.413 on each adverse party named in the decision from which the appeal is taken and on the Office of the Solicitor, Pacific Southwest Regional Solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior, 2800 Cottage Way, Room E-2753, Sacramento, California 95825-1890. Service must be accompanied by personally serving a copy to the party or by sending the document by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, to the address of record in the bureau, no later than 15 days after filing the document.

In addition, within thirty (30) days of receipt of this decision you have the right to file a petition for a stay together with your appeal in accordance with the regulations at 43 CFR 4.21. The petition must be served upon the same parties specified above.

Pursuant to 43 CFR 4.471(c), a petition for stay, if filed, must show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

- (1) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied;
- (2) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits;
- (3) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted; and,
- (4) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

43 CFR 4.471 (d) provides that the appellant requesting a stay bears the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

At the conclusion of any document that a party must serve, the party or its representative must sign a written statement certifying that service has been or will be made in accordance with the applicable rules and specifying the date and manner of such service (43 CFR 4.422(c)(2)).

Revised 10/9/2014